

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated March 19, 2004, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire June 19, 2004.

Applicants Have Overcome The 35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection

Claim 1, as amended, now recites in part,
determining bit width scaling functions for
scaling energy per event values for different bit
widths.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as clarified above, particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Based on these amendments, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Applicants Have Overcome The 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to clarify the recited method. Specifically, Claim 1 now recites in part,

establishing an energy macro table for a
particular bit width, said energy macro table
including energy per event values based on a
critical path delay period;
determining bit width scaling functions for
scaling energy per event values for different bit
widths; [and]
determining a normalizing period scaling
function to estimate the normalizing period for
the different bit widths.

Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, either individually or in combination.

Bogliolo teaches nothing regarding energy per event values in the table being based on a critical path delay period. The

Office Action concedes that Bogliolo fails to teach the steps of determining bit width scaling functions or a normalizing period scaling function.

Bhawmik teaches nothing regarding energy per event values in the table being based on a critical path delay period or determining bit width scaling functions. Therefore, Bhawmik fails to remedy the deficiency of Bogliolo.

Matsuo teaches nothing regarding energy per event values in the table being based on a critical path delay period or determining a normalizing period scaling function. Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuo also fails to disclose or suggest determining bit width scaling functions for scaling energy per event values for different bit widths. Therefore, Matsuo fails to remedy the deficiency of Bogliolo and Bhawmik.

Jochens teaches nothing regarding energy per event values in the table being based on a critical path delay period, determining bit width scaling functions for scaling energy per event values for different bit widths, or determining a normalizing period scaling function. Therefore, Jochens fails to remedy the deficiency of Bogliolo, Bhawmik, and Matsuo.

Because the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the recited limitations, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2-16 depend from Claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on those reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-16.

Applicants have amended Claim 17 to clarify the recited method. Specifically, Claim 17 now recites in part,

wherein calculating the typical clock period and performing bit width scaling are based on a critical path time delay.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest this limitation. Specifically, Bhawmik, Takahasi, Bogliolo, and Chen, either individually or in combination, fail to teach anything regarding this limitation. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 17.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 17 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 17. Based on those reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 18 and 19.

Moreover, Claim 18, as amended to clarify the acronyms, now recites, "wherein the energy per event table parameters include bit width, an absolute toggle rate for the inputs (TRin) for a circuit block, an absolute toggle rate for the outputs (TRout), and an average static probability for the inputs (SPin) of a circuit block". Because the cited references fail to disclose these parameters, Applicants request further reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 3-4, 7-15, and 19 include allowable subject matter. Based on Applicants' clarifications to Claims 1, 17, and 18, Applicants believe that Claims 3-4, 7-15, and 19 are patentable in their original form.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present Application.
Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully
requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the
undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this
case.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 35273

Jeanette S. Harms
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,537

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in
an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June
16, 2004.

6/16/2004 Rebecca A. Baumann
Date Signature: Rebecca A. Baumann